

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application.

In response to the Examiner's request for species election, applicant elects to prosecute species IX. The election is made with traverse.

Applicant notes that elements of the species set forth by the examiner are narrower than the elements recited in the claims. For instance, the claims are not limited to an alloy having a base element as set forth in the Examiner. Further, the language utilized to set forth each of the species in the present action is unclear and appears to require a base element, an element selected from element groups 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10, and to further require an additional element from the group set forth by the examiner in each delineated species. None of the claims recite this limitation and applicant is therefore not required to so limit the claims. Applicant therefore traverses the species restriction requirement and requests withdrawal or modification to clarify the restriction.

Since the language in the Office Action is unclear, it is uncertain as to which claims read upon the elected species IX. However, if the species set forth as species IX is intended to encompass targets wherein one of the elements is tantalum, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, and 20 are generic to the species, and claims 24 and 25 read upon the species.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 7, 2004

By: Jennifer J. Taylor
Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 48,711